



# Ethnographic Research in the Changing Context: Some Reflections on Ethical Issues and Dilemma

Mahendra Sapkota\*

*Postdoc Fellow, School of Ethnology and Sociology, Yunnan University, PR China*

**Abstract**—This paper provides a critical review of the ethical issues and methodological advancements in ethnographic research, focusing on the complexities and dilemmas introduced observed in empirical context by different scientific studies. By synthesizing existing literature, the paper examines key ethical concerns such as maintaining ongoing consent and confidentiality, as well as the challenge of balancing researcher engagement with the field, and subjective worldview with objective reality. It also explores the impact of technological advancements and digital tools, including their role in studying online communities and diverse cultural settings. These innovations offer substantial benefits for enhancing ethnographic research but also introduce new ethical dilemmas that require thoughtful consideration. To conclude, this paper highlights the necessity for researchers to integrate these new methodologies while upholding rigorous ethical standards, offering insights into how ethnographic practice can adapt to contemporary challenges while preserving its foundational principles.

**Index Terms**— ethnographic research, ethical issues, methodological advancements, digital tools, research review, research ethics.

## 1. Introduction

Ethnographic research, characterized by its qualitative and immersive approach, aims to explore cultural practices and social phenomena by deeply engaging with communities. Through extended observation and participation, ethnographers seek to understand the lived experiences of individuals within their natural environments. However, the unique depth of involvement inherent in this research method raises significant ethical concerns. Issues such as obtaining genuine informed consent, ensuring participant privacy, and mitigating the risk of harm or exploitation are particularly pronounced when dealing with vulnerable or marginalized groups (Murphy & Dingwall, 2001; Pierce, 2013; Pacheco-Vega & Parizeau, 2018). These ethical considerations are compounded by the close relationships that often develop between researchers and participants, making it challenging to maintain professional boundaries.

A key ethical dilemma in ethnography revolves around the tension between maintaining objectivity and the moral obligation to intervene. Researchers, in their pursuit of authentic representation, may encounter situations where they witness harmful practices or sensitive behaviors but must

decide whether to remain neutral or take action (Gobo, 2011; Hollis & Martinez, 2017). Additionally, the researcher's personal identity, biases, and position within the community can affect how data is collected and interpreted, leading to concerns over reflexivity and power imbalances. The continual negotiation between accurately representing participants' experiences and preserving their autonomy is critical to addressing these ethical challenges.

Despite being a widely adopted approach in qualitative research, ethnography often presents researchers with various challenges and dilemmas due to its intricate ethical considerations, extended fieldwork requirements, and the shifting socio-political landscapes within research sites. Given these complexities, this paper aims to critically examine and reflect on the key issues, debates, and conflicting perspectives that arise in ethnographic research.

## 2. Methods

The methodological approach of this paper is based on an extensive review of secondary data and scholarly literature. This involves systematically examining existing academic sources, such as journal articles, books, and other research publications, that discuss ethical challenges in ethnographic studies. By integrating insights from well-established theories and studies, the paper critically explores key debates surrounding ethnographic practices. These include ethical issues like informed consent, the dynamics of researcher-participant relationships, and the influence of socio-political factors on fieldwork. Through this literature-based method, the paper identifies common themes, highlights gaps in existing research, and offers a reflective, evidence-informed analysis of the complexities involved in ethnographic methods.

## 3. Result and Discussion

The ethical implications in ethnography extend to the setting of the research problem, nature of data collection, the method of analysis and interpretation of subjective realities derived with ethnographic research. Ensuring participants' voices are portrayed accurately while safeguarding their confidentiality requires careful consideration. Misrepresentation and selective reporting or documentation are risks that can undermine the ethical integrity of the research (Hammersley & Atkinson,

\*Corresponding author: [sapkota.mahendra27@gmail.com](mailto:sapkota.mahendra27@gmail.com)

2019). Therefore, ethnographic researchers must engage in ongoing ethical reflexivity, critically assessing their decisions throughout the research process (Deng, 2023). Striking a balance between ethical sensitivity and producing credible research outcomes remains a key challenge for ethnographers. With these observations, the paper synthesizes following eight ethical issues and dilemmas of ethnographic research.

### 1) *Informed consent and the complexities of the agreement*

Informed consent is a cornerstone of ethical research practice, yet it presents unique challenges in ethnographic studies. Unlike other methodologies, where consent is generally obtained at the outset, ethnography requires a continuous renegotiation of consent throughout the study. This is because ethnographic research often unfolds over extended periods, during which new circumstances, interactions, and understandings emerge, necessitating ongoing dialogue between researchers and participants (Huber & Imeri, 2021; Murphy & Dingwall, 2001). The dynamic, evolving nature of the research context means that participants' views about their involvement and its associated risks may change, making continuous consent a necessary part of the ethical process (Gobo, 2011; Murphy & Dingwall, 2007).

Power imbalances in ethnographic research can complicate obtaining meaningful consent. In communities with limited exposure to academic research or where disparities exist between the researcher and participants, there is a risk that participants may consent without fully understanding the implications, especially if they see the researcher as an authority figure or expect some form of compensation (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2019; Russell & Barley, 2020). Therefore, researchers must take a nuanced approach, ensuring participants fully comprehend what their participation entails and regularly reaffirming consent as circumstances evolve. Such ethical vigilance is critical in respecting participants' autonomy and rights throughout the research.

### 2) *Maintaining confidentiality and privacy of the community sentiments*

Ensuring participant confidentiality is a significant ethical challenge in ethnography, especially in tightly-knit communities where maintaining anonymity can be difficult. In these contexts, even with the use of pseudonyms or anonymization techniques, individuals can still be identified based on subtle details or unique characteristics (Jerolmack & Murphy, 2019; Tolich, 2004). The close connections within such communities mean that personal details, when shared in research reports, could inadvertently reveal participants' identities, putting them at risk of social repercussions. Thus, researchers face a delicate balancing act between providing rich, contextualized data and safeguarding participant privacy (Flick, 2018; Lee, 2018; Vorhölter, 2021).

To address this issue, researchers often have to generalize or omit certain details, which may compromise the depth and specificity of their findings. This tension underscores the ethical responsibility to protect participant identity while presenting accurate, context-rich insights. In small communities, even the disclosure of seemingly insignificant information—like a participant's job, family structure, or unique life experiences—

can lead to unintentional identification. Hence, confidentiality in ethnography requires a careful, context-aware strategy that considers both the ethical imperatives and the need for methodological integrity.

### 3) *Influence of power dynamics and the researcher's influence*

Power relations between researchers and participants significantly shape ethnographic research outcomes. Researchers, by virtue of their external position, academic background, and socio-economic status, often possess inherent privileges that can influence how they interact with participants and how participants respond (Pillow, 2003). For this, insider perspective of ethnographer is essential (Simmons, 2007). This power imbalance can lead participants to modify their behavior or responses to align with what they believe the researcher wants, affecting the authenticity of the data collected. Reflexivity, where researchers critically assess the influence of their own identity and positionality, is key to navigating these power dynamics and ensuring ethical rigor (Baqai, 2024; Finlay, 2002).

In this context, Seim (2024) introduces the concept of "hybrid ethnography," which integrates "participant observation" and "observant participation" as distinct yet complementary approaches. Participant observation involves the researcher engaging with a group or community primarily as an observer who occasionally participates, while observant participation involves the researcher fully integrating into the group's activities, with observation taking a secondary role. This hybrid approach, which allows researchers to fluidly shift between roles based on the evolving contexts of the research environment, appears more adaptable and contextually relevant. However, balancing these two approaches methodologically can be challenging, potentially leading to strategic difficulties that may dilute the essence of ethnographic research.

A skilled ethnographer understands that not all individuals or research participants can express themselves verbally. However, it is essential to access, observe, and listen to them in their own contexts, appreciating both who they are and why they are the way they are. The dominance of power elites in the research area (Declercq & Ayala, 2017), inter-subjectivity of research participants (Vitalis Pemunta, 2010); visibility and invisibility of the issues/ identities reflected in the data collection (Baqai, 2024) and the power dynamics between researcher and the researched (Chen, 2011) are some critical issues in this regard. An equally significant dilemma to address is the balance between private life and work life, which requires consideration of the diverse subjective experiences of both the researcher and the participants (Hall, 2009). This balance reflects the complexities inherent in managing personal boundaries while engaging in research, highlighting the need for sensitivity to the varied perspectives of all involved.

The dual role of participating and observing can further complicate these power dynamics. Researchers who become too involved risk over-identifying with certain community factions, leading to bias, while maintaining too much distance can limit their understanding of the community's practices (Dossa & Golubovic, 2018; Rose, 1997). Researchers must

continuously reflect on their roles, remaining aware of how their presence and actions impact the community and the data they collect. Transparent communication and ethical reflexivity are essential to maintaining trust and ensuring that the research reflects participants' realities.

#### 4) *Ethical tensions in representing participant voices*

Accurately representing participants' voices in ethnographic research involves navigating complex ethical tensions. The process of transforming lived experiences into academic narratives is inherently interpretative, and there is a risk of distorting or misrepresenting participants' stories (Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Philipps, 2016). Ethnographers must strike a balance between faithfully conveying these stories and aligning with theoretical frameworks or academic standards (Denzin, 2001; Robinson, 2014). Given the richness and complexity of ethnographic data, there is often a temptation to selectively highlight certain perspectives that support the researcher's theoretical stance or to fit within broader academic discourses (Flick, 2018).

This selective reporting can marginalize some voices within the community, leading to a partial or skewed depiction of the collective experience. Additionally, ethnographers may encounter conflicting narratives from different community members, each offering divergent or contradictory perspectives. Balancing these competing narratives requires a commitment to presenting a multiplicity of voices while being transparent about the researcher's interpretive role. Ethical ethnography involves not only representing participants authentically but also acknowledging the limitations and biases inherent in any interpretative process.

#### 5) *Navigating ethical boundaries in participant observation*

Participant observation, a central method in ethnography, involves researchers immersing themselves in the daily lives of participants. However, this immersion raises ethical questions about the boundaries between involvement and objectivity. Researchers must engage enough to gain genuine insights while avoiding over-involvement that could lead to ethical conflicts or compromise the integrity of the research (Buscatto, 2018; DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011). This balance becomes especially challenging when researchers encounter illegal, unethical, or harmful behaviors during their fieldwork, as they must decide whether to intervene or remain an impartial observer (Byrne, 2017; Hammersley & Traianou, 2012).

For instance, researchers may find themselves witnessing acts of discrimination, exploitation, or violence. Deciding whether to report these behaviors or maintain the role of a neutral observer presents a significant ethical dilemma. Intervening can disrupt the trust and rapport built with participants, while remaining silent might imply complicity in such practices (Flick, 2018; Mannik & McGarry, 2017). Yet, equally is the important of reading and noting the silences and less expressed issues in the qualitative research. Researchers must develop clear ethical guidelines and strategies to address these situations, balancing the need for ethical integrity with the requirements of participant observation. Ongoing ethical reflection and engagement with peers can help in navigating these complex situations.

#### 6) *Reflexivity and ethical accountability in ethnography*

Ethical ethnographic research relies heavily on reflexivity and accountability. Reflexivity involves researchers critically examining their own biases, assumptions, and the power relations that influence their research (Berry, 2011; Finlay, 2002). Given the immersive and often subjective nature of ethnography, reflexivity ensures that researchers remain ethically grounded by being aware of how their identity and positionality shape their interactions with participants and the research outcomes. Reflexivity also promotes transparency in acknowledging the limitations and biases that can affect the study.

Accountability in ethnography extends beyond reflexivity to encompass a responsibility towards both the participants and the wider academic community. This involves ensuring that participants' narratives are accurately represented while protecting their dignity and rights throughout the research process (Hodgson, 1999; Mosher et al., 2017; Rose, 1997). Researchers must also be open about the decisions made during data analysis and presentation, especially when navigating conflicting ethical obligations. By upholding ethical accountability and engaging in reflexive practice, ethnographers can better navigate the challenges and dilemmas inherent in their research while making meaningful contributions to scholarly knowledge.

#### 7) *'Dos and do nots' dilemma in ethnographic research*

In ethnographic research, the "do and do not" dilemma refers to the ethical challenges of balancing deep involvement with participants and maintaining necessary objectivity. Ethnographers often engage closely with the communities they study to gain rich, nuanced insights, which requires them to actively participate in daily activities and form personal connections with members (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2019; Madden, 2022). However, this active participation can complicate the researcher's role, as it may lead to a loss of objectivity or potential biases if the researcher becomes too entangled in the community's life (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011; Fetterman, 2019). Striking the right balance is essential: too much involvement may skew the researcher's perspective, while excessive detachment can limit the depth of understanding and the richness of the data gathered.

On the other hand, the dilemma also involves what researchers should avoid to adhere to ethical principles. Ethnographers must be cautious not to disrupt community dynamics or harm participants, particularly when confronted with unethical or illegal behaviors (Hammersley & Traianou, 2012). Deciding whether to intervene or remain an observer in such situations poses a significant ethical challenge, as intervening might breach participant trust, whereas not taking action might be seen as condoning inappropriate behavior. Therefore, researchers need a well-considered approach to navigate these ethical issues, balancing their moral responsibilities with their commitment to maintaining scholarly rigor (Flick, 2018; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2019). Effective ethnographic research demands careful navigation of these ethical boundaries to ensure both the integrity of the research and the welfare of participants.

### 8) Innovations, diversities, and the future directions in ethnographic research

Recent advancements have significantly transformed ethnographic research, largely due to the integration of new technologies and methodological innovations. The use of digital tools such as social media platforms, online forums, and digital recording technologies has enhanced data collection and analysis processes, making them more efficient and comprehensive (Paoli & D'Auria, 2021; Pink et al., 2016). Digital ethnography, for example, utilizes these technologies to explore online communities and interactions, extending the reach of traditional ethnographic methods into the digital realm (Airoldi, 2018; Murthy, 2008). These innovations enable researchers to engage with a broader array of social contexts and phenomena, providing richer insights into how individuals and groups operate within digital spaces. This evolution reflects a growing adaptability in ethnographic research, allowing it to accommodate new forms of social engagement and expression.

Ethnographic research has also seen increased diversity in both its subject matter and methodological approaches. Researchers are now examining a wider range of cultural and social settings, including urban and rural environments, as well as various traditional and contemporary contexts (Daynes & Williams, 2018; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2019). This shift signifies an effort to represent a broader spectrum of human experiences and social practices. Additionally, there is a heightened awareness of the need to incorporate diverse perspectives and voices within research, especially those from marginalized or underrepresented groups (Adler & Adler, 2008; Hollis & Martinez Jr, 2017; Marcus, 1995). By expanding its focus and methodologies, ethnography can more effectively capture the complexities of modern social life and provide a more inclusive view of human behavior.

Indeed, rise of qualitative research paradigms are based on the methodological innovations, applications and divergences (Sapkota, 2019). This seems also true in case of ethnographic research. Looking to the future, ethnographic research is expected to continue evolving through the incorporation of innovative methodologies while addressing emerging ethical and practical challenges. Researchers are encouraged to explore interdisciplinary approaches and leverage new technologies to enrich their studies (Pink et al., 2016). However, it is crucial to critically assess the ethical implications of these innovations, such as ensuring privacy and informed consent in digital environments (Murthy, 2008; Melhuus et al., 2022; Wall, 2015). Future ethnographic work should maintain a strong emphasis on reflexivity and adaptability, staying responsive to the changing dynamics of social phenomena and the diverse contexts in which they occur. By embracing these advancements while upholding rigorous ethical standards, ethnographic research can continue to offer valuable insights into the complexities of human interactions and social structures.

### 4. Conclusion

This paper has delved into the ethical challenges and innovative developments in ethnographic research, highlighting

the intricate balance researchers must strike between maintaining methodological rigor and adhering to ethical standards. Addressing ongoing consent and confidentiality issues is crucial for ensuring that research is conducted with sensitivity and respect for participants. The integration of digital tools and exploration of diverse cultural contexts have significantly broadened the scope of ethnographic studies, providing richer insights into contemporary social dynamics. Nevertheless, these advancements also introduce new ethical considerations that require careful management to preserve the integrity of the research and safeguard participant welfare.

As ethnographic research continues to advance, it is essential for scholars to integrate new methodologies while remaining committed to ethical principles. The evolving nature of social research demands that researchers be both innovative and reflective, addressing new challenges and adapting to emerging technological environments. By prioritizing ethical vigilance and methodological adaptability, ethnographers can enhance their studies' depth and impact, contributing meaningfully to both academic knowledge and societal understanding. The future of ethnographic research depends on its ability to navigate these evolving demands, ensuring that progress in research techniques is achieved without compromising ethical standards or participant well-being.

### Acknowledgments

The author would like to acknowledge School of Ethnology and Sociology, Yunnan University, PR China, for their technical, financial and methodological support in developing this paper under a postdoctoral project.

### References

- [1] Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (2008). Of rhetoric and representation: The four faces of ethnography. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 49(1), 1-30. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40220055>
- [2] Airoldi, M. (2018). Ethnography and the digital fields of social media. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(6), 661-673. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2018.1465622>
- [3] Baqai, H. (2024). Unveiling the Invisible: Ethnographic Insights into Hidden Power Structures. *Journal of Political Stability Archive*, 2(01), 48-57. <https://journalpsa.com/index.php/JPSA/article/view/13/15>
- [4] Berry, K. (2011). The ethnographic choice: Why ethnographers do ethnography. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, 11(2), 165-177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708611401335>
- [5] Buscatto, M. (2018). Doing ethnography: Ways and reasons. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data collection*, 327-343. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526416070.n22>
- [6] Byrne, G. (2017). Narrative inquiry and the problem of representation: 'giving voice', making meaning. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 40(1), 36-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2015.1034097>
- [7] Chen, S. H. (2011). Power relations between the researcher and the researched: An analysis of native and nonnative ethnographic interviews. *Field methods*, 23(2), 119-135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X10387575>
- [8] Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (1986). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. University of California Press. <https://www.ucpress.edu/books/writing-culture/paper>
- [9] Daynes, S., & Williams, T. (2018). *On ethnography*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119206437>
- [10] Declercq, J., & Ayala, R. A. (2017). Examining "Elite" power dynamics in informant-research relations and its impact on ethnographic data construction: A case study from pharmaceutical health communication. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1).



- <https://1609406917704137>
- [11] Deng, C. (2023). When ethnography meets scientific aspiration: a comparative exploration of ethnography in anthropology and accounting. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRAM-11-2022-0183>
- [12] Denzin, N. K. (2001). *Interpretive Interactionism* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [13] DeWalt, K. M., & DeWalt, B. R. (2011). *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers* (2nd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- [14] Dossa, P., & Golubovic, J. (2018). Community-Based Ethnography. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1-7.
- [15] Fetterman, D. M. (2019). *Ethnography: Step-by-step*. Sage publications.
- [16] Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the Researcher: The Provenance, Process, and Practice of Reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(4), 531-545. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973202129120052>
- [17] Flick, U. (2018). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [18] Gobo, G. (2011). *Ethnography*. In Silverman, D. (Ed.), *Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., pp. 15-34). SAGE Publications.
- [19] Hall, S. M. (2009). 'Private life' and 'work life': difficulties and dilemmas when making and maintaining friendships with ethnographic participants. *Area*, 41(3), 263-272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2009.00880.x>
- [20] Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2019). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Routledge.
- [21] Hammersley, M., & Traianou, A. (2012). *Ethics in Qualitative Research: Controversies and Contexts*. SAGE Publications.
- [22] Hodgson, D. L. (1999). Critical interventions: Dilemmas of accountability in contemporary ethnographic research. *Identities Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 6(2-3), 201-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.1999.9962646>
- [23] Hollis, M. E., & Martinez Jr, R. (2017). Introduction to the Special Issue on Ethnography from the Margins: Why We Need to Understand the Relationship Between Power, Powerlessness, and Marginalization. *sociological focus*, 50(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2016.1218211>
- [24] Huber, E., & Imeri, S. (2021). Informed consent in ethnographic research: A common practice facing new challenges. *Qualiservice Working Papers 4-2021, Bremen*, <https://doi.org/10.26092/elib/1070>
- [25] Jerolmack, C., & Murphy, A. K. (2019). The ethical dilemmas and social scientific trade-offs of masking in ethnography. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 48(4), 801-827. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124117701483>
- [26] Lee, C. (2018). Culture, consent and confidentiality in workplace autoethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, 7(3), 302-319. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOE-06-2017-0032>
- [27] Madden, R. (2022). Being ethnographic: A guide to the theory and practice of ethnography (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [28] Mannik, L., & McGarry, K. (Eds.). (2017). *Practicing ethnography: A student guide to method and methodology*. University of Toronto Press.
- [29] Marcus, G. E. (1995). *Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography*. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 95-117. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.24.100195.000523>
- [30] Melhuus, M., Mitchell, J. P., & Wulff, H. (Eds.). (2022). *Ethnographic practice in the present*. Berghahn Books.
- [31] Mosher, R., Long, J., Le, E., & Harding, L. (2017). Agency and agendas: Revisiting the roles of the researcher and the researched in ethnographic fieldwork. *Anthropologica*, 145-156. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26350554>.
- [32] Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2001). The ethics of ethnography. In Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography* (pp. 339-351). SAGE Publications.
- [33] Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007). Informed consent, anticipatory regulation and ethnographic practice. *Social science & medicine*, 65(11), 2223-2234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.08.008>
- [34] Murthy, D. (2008). *Digital Ethnography: An Examination of the Use of New Technologies for Social Research*. *Sociology Compass*, 2(1), 338-348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0038038508094565>
- [35] Pacheco-Vega, R., & Parizeau, K. (2018). Doubly engaged ethnography: Opportunities and challenges when working with vulnerable communities. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1), 1609406918790653. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918790653>
- [36] Paoli, A. D., & D'Auria, V. (2021). Digital ethnography: a systematic literature review. *Italian Sociological Review*, 11(4S), 243-243. <https://doi.org/10.13136/isr.v11i4S.434>
- [37] Phillips, D. P. (2016). Interpreting and presenting marginalized voices through intersubjective accounts. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 16(1), 26-38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-03-2015-0020>
- [38] Pierce, J. (2013). Writing for Equity Inside and Out: Emerging scholars of color doing ethnography with a marginalized population. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, 13(6), 481-488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708613503775>
- [39] Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, Catharsis, or Cure? Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000060635>
- [40] Pink, S., Horst, H. A., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T., & Tacchi, J. (2016). *Digital Ethnography: Principles and Practice*. SAGE Publications.
- [41] Robinson, J. V. (2014). Dilemmas and deliberations in reflexive ethnographic research. *Ethnography and Education*, 9(2), 196-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2014.897245>
- [42] Rose, G. (1997). Situating Knowledges: Positionality, Reflexivities, and Other Tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(3), 305-320. <https://doi.org/10.1191/030913297673302122>
- [43] Russell, L., & Barley, R. (2020). Ethnography, ethics and ownership of data. *Ethnography*, 21(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138119859386>
- [44] Sapkota, M. (2019). Research Philosophy in Development Studies: An Inquiry from Qualitative Design. *Research Nepal Journal of Development Studies*, 2(1), 137-150. <https://doi.org/10.3126/rmjds.v2i1.25278>
- [45] Seim, J. (2024). Participant observation, observant participation, and hybrid ethnography. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 53(1), 121-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124120986209>
- [46] Simmons, M. (2007). Insider ethnography: tinker, tailor, researcher or spy?. *Nurse Researcher*, 14(4), 7-17. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2007.07.14.4.7.c6039>
- [47] Tolich, M. (2004). Internal Confidentiality: When Confidentiality Assurances Fail Relational Informants. *Qualitative Sociology*, 27(1), 101-106. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:QUAS.0000015546.20441.4a>
- [48] Vitalis Pemunta, N. (2010). Intersubjectivity and power in ethnographic research. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 10(2), 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ1002003>
- [49] Vorhölder, J. (2021). Anthropology anonymous? Pseudonyms and confidentiality as challenges for ethnography in the twenty-first century. *Ethnoscripts*, 23(1), 15-33. <https://journals.sub.uni-hamburg.de/ethnoscripts/article/view/1652>
- [50] Wall, S. S. (2015). Focused ethnography: A methodological adaptation for social research in emerging contexts. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, vol. 16, no. 1. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-16.1.2182>